

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00039 01 OF 02 021454Z

43

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 089051

P R 021210Z MAR 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2959

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 SALT TWO GENEVA 0039

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF MARCH 2, 1976 (SALT TWO - 923)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON
AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF MARCH 2, 1976.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON
MARCH 2, 1976

MR. MINISTER,

I

THE UNITED STATES HAS CAREFULLY CONSIDERED THE VIEWS EXPRESSED
BY THE SOVIET DELEGATION WITH RESPECT TO US PROPOSALS FOR ARTICLES XV
II

AND XI OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEXT. IN THIS CONSIDERATION WE HAVE TAKEN N
OTE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00039 01 OF 02 021454Z

OF THE CONCERNS THE SOVIET DELEGATION HAS EXPRESSED WITH RESPECT TO S

OME
OF THE PROPOSALS FOR THOSE ARTICLES JUST AS WE HOPE THAT THE SOVIET S
IDE
APPRECIATES THE CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY THE US DELEGATION. THIS HAS LED
US TO CONSIDER WAYS WHEREBY THERE COULD BE A MUTUAL ACCOMMODATION TO
THE CONCERNS OF BOTH SIDES AND THUS OPEN THE WAY TO RESOLVE OUR DIFFE
RENCES
ON THESE ISSUES.

IT IS IN THIS SPIRIT THAT WE HAVE DEVELOPED THE PROPOSAL THAT I WI
LL
MAKE TODAY. ITS VARIOUS ELEMENTS CONSTITUTE AN INTEGRAL WHOLE.

II

IN ITS APPROACH TO ARTICLE XVII THE US HAS BEEN SEEKING TO INSURE
UNIFORM APPLICATION BY BOTH SIDES OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW AGREEM
ENT
RELATING TO THE AGGREGATE LIMITATIONS. BOTH SIDES USE NATIONAL TECHNICAL
CAL
MEANS OF VERIFICATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING ASSURANCE OF COMPL
I-
ANCE. THAT FUNDAMENTAL UNDERSTANDING IS NOT IN QUESTION. INSTEAD THE
QUESTION IS WHETHER SPECIFIC ITEMS OBSERVED BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEA
NS
ARE INCLUDED OR NOT INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE LIMITATIONS. THIS QUEST
ION
HAS IN PART BEEN ADDRESSED IN OUR NEGOTIATIONS. THUS, BOTH SIDES ARE
SEEKING AGREEMENT ON DEFINITIONS IN ARTICLE II, AGREEMENT ON PROVISIO
NS
FOR WHEN ARMS ENTER THE AGGREGATES IN ARTICLE VI, AND AGREEMENT WHEN
TO DISMANTLE OR DESTROY EXCESS OR PROHIBITED ARMS IN ARTICLE XI. IN
SHORT, WE HAVE BEEN DEVELOPING MUTUALLY AGREED STANDARDS ON THIS MATT
ER.
HOWEVER, IT IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT THAT THERE BE ASSURANCE THAT THESE
STANDARDS ARE APPLIED IN A UNIFORM MANNER BY BOTH PARTIES.

CERTAINLY NEITHER THE US NOR THE SOVIET UNION WANTS THE NEW AGREE-
MENT TO ENTER INTO FORCE AMIDST UNCERTAINTIES WHICH COULD LEAD TO DIF
FI-

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00039 01 OF 02 021454Z

CULTIES AND DISPUTES. YET AS OBLIGATIONS IN THIS NEW AGREEMENT COME I
NTO
FORCE THE POSSIBILITY OF DIFFERENCES AND DISPUTES COULD IMMEDIATELY A
RISE.
FOR EXAMPLE, THE SIDES ARE AGREED THAT STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS IN EX
-
CESS OF THE AGGREGATE LIMITATIONS MUST BE DISMANTLED OR DESTROYED. IN
THIS REGARD, HOW CAN WE ASSURE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES ON THE

NUMBER OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS WHICH ARE SUBJECT EITHER TO INCLUSION
IN THE AGGREGATES OR TO DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION AS EXCESS? SUCH
AN AGREEMENT REQUIRES THAT BOTH PARTIES, EMPLOYING NATIONAL TECHNICAL
MEANS AND UNIFORMLY APPLYING AGREED STANDARDS, REACH THE SAME CON-
CLUSIONS REGARDING THE NUMBERS OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS POSSESSED
BY EACH PARTY. YET HOW ARE TH PARTIES TO KNOW WHETHER OR NOT THEY
HAVE EACH REACHED THE SAME CONCLUSIONS? THIS CAN BE DONE ONLY BY AGREEMENT ON THE ACTUAL NUMBERS INVOLVED.

III

THE US BELIEVES IT IS BETTER TO MEET AND RESOLVE THESE ISSUES SOONER
RATHER THAN LATER. WHEN THE TWO PARTIES ARE PREPARED TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT AS THE FIRST STEP TOWARD ITS ENTRY INTO FORCE, NEITHER PARTY SHOULD
THEN BE FACED WITH UNCERTAINTY OVER WHAT THE OTHER PARTY CONSIDERS ARE
THE NUMBERS OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF
THE AGREEMENT. SUCH UNCERTAINTY SHOULD BE RESOLVED BEFORE THE SIGNATURE
OF THE AGREEMENT IN ORDER TO FORESTALL QUESTIONS WHICH COULD COMPLICATE
ITS RATIFICATION AND ENTRY INTO FORCE.

ACCORDINGLY, MR. MINISTER, THE US CONSIDERS IT ESSENTIAL THAT BY
THE TIME OF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT THERE BE AGREEMENT ON THE NUMBERS
OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS IN EACH CATEGORY POSSESSED BY EACH SIDE AS
OF THAT DATE. CHANGES TO SUCH NUMBERS WOULD BE REPORTED TWICE A YEAR
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 00039 01 OF 02 021454Z

IN
THE STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION.

UNDER THE APPROACH I HAVE JUST OUTLINED NEITHER SIDE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON ITS PLANNED FUTURE FORCES OR TO GIVE
PRIOR
NOTIFICATION OF ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN. YET BOTH SIDES WOULD BE ABLE TO
ENTER
INTO THE AGREEMENT WITH CONFIDENCE THAT ITS LIMITATIONS WILL BE UNIFORMLY
APPLIED.

IV

IF A SATISFACTORY UNDERSTANDING CAN BE REACHED ON THE MATTER I HAVE

JUST DISCUSSED, THE US, FOR ITS PART, WOULD BE PREPARED TO MODIFY ITS
PRO-
POSALS WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES XVII AND XI.

WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLE XVII, WE WOULD BE PREPARED TO OMIT PARA-
GRAPHS 2(A) AND 2(I) OF THAT ARTICLE. WE WOULD ALSO BE PREPARED TO
ELIMINATE, IN PARAGRAPH 2(B) OF THAT ARTICLE, THE OBLIGATION OF PRIOR
NOTI-
FICATION, AS WELL AS THE REFERENCES TO "CONVERSION" AND THE BRACKETED
REFERENCE TO "DATES". WE BELIEVE THESE MODIFICATIONS WOULD ENABLE US
TO REACH AGREEMENT ON ALL OF ARTICLE XVII.

AS ANOTHER ELEMENT OF ITS PROPOSAL, THE US WOULD BE PREPARED TO
MODIFY ITS POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLE XI OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEX
T. IN
THIS CONNECTION WE NOTE THAT THE SCC HAS ALREADY ESTABLISHED, FOR THE
INTERIM AGREEMENT, TIME PERIODS FOR THE COMPLETION OF DISMANTLING OR
DESTRUCTION OF ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS. UNDER PROCEDURES AGREED
UPON IN THE PROTOCOL ON PROCEDURES GOVERNING REPLACEMENT, DISMANTLING
OR DESTRUCTION, AND NOTIFICATION THEREOF, FOR STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARM
S,
SIGNED AT MOSCOW ON JULY 2, 1974, THE SIDES ESTABLISHED MUTUALLY AC-
CEPTABLE TIME PERIODS FOR THESE TAKS. FOR EXAMPLE, PARAGRAPH II.5
OF THOSE PROCEDURES STATES THAT "DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OF REPLAC
ED
ICBM LAUNCHERS SHALL BE COMPLETED NO LATER THAN FOUR MONTHS AFTER THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 SALT T 00039 01 OF 02 021454Z

REPLACEMENT SUBMARIN BEGINS SEA TRIALS." AS FOR SLBM LAUNCHERS,
PARAGRAPH III.4 OF THOSE PROCEDURES STATES THAT THE DISMANTLING OR DE
-
STRUCTION "SHALL BE COMPLETED NO LATER THAN SIX MONTHS AFTER THE REPL
ACE-
MENT SUBMARINE BEGINS SEA TRIALS." ALTHOUGH THERE IS NO PRECEDENT FOR
HEAVY BOMBERS, THEIR DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION IS CLEARLY A LESS TIM
E-
CONSUMING OPERATION THAN THOSEOF THE OTHER TWO SYSTEMS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00039 02 OF 02 021457Z

42

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 089092

P R 021210Z MAR 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2960

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 SALT TWO GENEVA 0039

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

THE US CONTINUES TO BELIEVE IT IS PREFERABLE THAT THE DISMANTLING
OR DESTRUCTION OF EXCESS SYSTEMS BE COMPLETED NOT LATER THAN OCTOBER
3,
1977. HOWEVER, AS PART OF THE PROPOSAL BEING MADE TODAY, THE US WOULD

BE PREPARED TO AGREE THAT THE REQUIRED DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OF
EXCESS SYSTEMS MUST BEGIN NOT LATER THAN THE DATE OF EXPIRATION OF THE

INTERIM AGREEMENT AND MUST BE COMPLETED WITHIN THE FOLLOWING PERIODS
FROM THAT DATE:

(A) SIX MONTHS FOR SLBM LAUNCHERS;

(B) FOUR MONTHS FOR ICBM LAUNCHERS;

(C) THREE MONTHS FOR HEAVY BOMBERS;

(D) WITHIN THE SHORTEST POSSIBLE AGREED TIME PERIOD FOR

ANY OTHER EXCESS STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS, BUT NO

LATER THAN SIX MONTHS AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00039 02 OF 02 021457Z

INTERIM AGREEMENT.

AS REGARDS STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS PROHIBITED BY PROVISIONS OF THIS
AGREEMENT, THE US WOULD BE PREPARED TO PROPOSE THAT THEY BE DISMANTLED

OR DESTROYED WITHIN THE SHORTEST POSSIBLE AGREED TIME PERIOD, BUT NO
LATER THAN SIX MONTHS AFTER ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THOSE PROVISIONS.

V

MR. MINISTER, I BELIEVE THAT THE PROPOSAL I HAVE PRESENTED TODAY WILL ENABLE US TO MOVE FORWARD IN OUR EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THE UNDERSTANDING REACHED AT VLADIVOSTOK. I MUST REPEAT, HOWEVER, THAT THE CHANGES WE PREPARED TO MAKE WITH RESPTEC TO

ARTICLES XVII AND XI ARE CONTINGENT UPON THE SATISFACTORY RESOLUTION OF THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING UNIFORM APPLICATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THIS NEW AGREEMENT WHICH I HAVE OUTLINED TODAY IN THE FIRST PART OF MY STATEMENT.
JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: TEXT, POLICIES, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 02 MAR 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: coburnhl
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT00039
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760079-0297
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t197603104/aaaadnkr.tel
Line Count: 290
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: coburnhl
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 FEB 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 FEB 2004 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <01 SEP 2004 by coburnhl>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF MARCH 2, 1976 (SALT TWO - 923)
TAGS: PARM, UR, US, (JOHNSON, U ALEXIS)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006